

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. By this Preliminary Amendment, new claim 28 is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-12, 14, 15, 17-21, 23, 24, 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Zdybel (U.S. Patent No. 5,486,686); and claims 4, 7, 13, 16, 22 and 25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zdybel. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as applied to claims 1-28.

In particular, Applicants assert that Zdybel does not disclose or suggest a system for producing and processing a paper document, having at least a token generator that generates user-selectable tokens, and a selector that allows a user to select one or more of the tokens from a list, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 10 and 19.

Furthermore, Applicants assert that Zdybel does not disclose or suggest a system for processing a paper document, having at least a scanner that reads embedded tokens in the paper document, a segment token decoder that receives image data from the scanner and identifies and decodes the tokens in order to generate a list of tokens, and a token selector that allows a user to select which tokens to access from the list, as recited in independent claim 28.

Zdybel discloses an electronic document processing system that can couple hardcopy outputs to an electronic document from which a human readable hardcopy is produced. See col. 1, lines 11-15. Zdybel enables data which is potentially important to the accuracy and/or completeness of the reconstruction of the electronic source document 32 to be recovered, even if such data is not evident or inferable from the appearance of the human readable rendering of the source document. See col. 10, lines 7-27. The system can be utilized for

storing and communicating a machine readable description of all or any selected part of the electronic source document 32, as well as a descriptions of the equipment in process employed for producing the source document 32 and the human readable rendering 45. See col. 10 lines 40-45. Documents can be printed to include digitally embedded data descriptions and can be distributed by mail. See col. 10 lines 55-60.

In stark contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, Zdybel does not disclose or suggest a system for producing and processing a paper document, having at least a token generator that generates user-selectable tokens, and a selector that allows a user to select one or more of the tokens from a list.

Moreover, Zdybel does not disclose or suggest a system for processing a paper document, having at least a scanner that reads embedded tokens in the paper document, a segment token decoder that receives image data from the scanner and identifies and decodes the tokens in order to generate a list of tokens, and a token selector that allows a user to select which tokens to access from the list.

On the contrary, Zdybel only discloses that the system can be utilized for determining which machine readable descriptions will be stored and communicated when producing the document, but not when recreating the document. Furthermore, the system in Zdybel discloses that glyph encoded data may be embedded in the hardcopy document 102. However, nowhere in Zdybel is it disclosed that a token generator generates user-selectable tokens on the paper document so that a selector may be used to allow a user to select one or more of the user-selectable tokens from a list when recreating the document. Because Zdybel fails to disclose its features, Zdybel does not allow a user to individually select tokens that represent references, documents, services and/or programs that have been gathered and inputted into individual user-selectable tokens at the token generator. Thus, Applicants assert


that it is not an inherent feature in Zdybel to have a selector that allows a user to select one or more user-selectable tokens from list.

Accordingly, because Zdybel fails to disclose this feature, Applicants assert that independent claims 1, 10, 19 and 28 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-9, 11-18 and 20-27 depend from independent claims 1, 10 and 19, respectively, and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as applied to claims 1-28 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-28 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believed anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Richard S. Elias
Registration No. P-48,806

JAO:RSE/ala

Attachment:
Appendix

Date: August 9, 2001

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037
--